

April 10, 1972

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

Approved For Release 2001/03/04 : CIA-RDP80-01601R00

Alaskan pipeline are being unrealistic in their zealous attempts to preserve Alaska as a frozen wonderland.

David R. Brower, a leading spokesman for the conservationists, has said that the Alaskan controversy is "nothing less than a test case of what the struggle to save this planet is all about . . . we need a cooling of this drive for more energy . . . we must cut down on the use of fossil fuels."

We submit that this concept, if extended to its irrational conclusion, would mean a return to travel by horse and buggy and illumination by candlelight. By practical contrast, the U.S. is being forced to rely increasingly on oil imports from the turbulent Middle East, where Russian influence leaves us dangerously and increasingly exposed to potential coercion.

All the pros and cons of the pipeline con-

troversy have been voiced in more than three years of debate. At least 12 exhaustive federal reports have been compiled. Interior Secretary Morton is expected by both sides to issue the go-ahead permit, but to date it remains mysteriously withheld after a number of postponements.

We urge granting the permit with no further delay. Even that would not mean an all-out green light. The conservationists could and presumably would block actual pipeline construction for another year or even permanently by appeals up to the Supreme Court.

The permit should be hedged around with every rational condition possible to prevent permanent environmental injury, and to require repair of temporary injury during construction. But the overriding point is: It should be done as soon as possible.

RAILROAD NATIONALIZATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the March 27 issue of Railway Age contains a fascinating statistical table that demolishes the myth that nationalized railroads often return a tidy profit to their shareholders—the taxpayers of the various countries which have nationalized railroads. The truth is very different. The truth is that where railroads are nationalized, taxpayers must make up staggering losses.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MYTH: NATIONALIZED RAILWAYS OFTEN RETURN A TIDY PROFIT TO THEIR "SHAREHOLDERS"

TRUTH: WHERE RAILS ARE NATIONALIZED, TAXPAYERS MUST MAKE UP STAGGERING LOSSES

(In thousands of dollars)

	Subsidy payments	Deficits after subsidy	Total cost to taxpayers	Taxes paid	Net profit		Subsidy payments	Deficits after subsidy	Total cost to taxpayers	Taxes paid	Net profit
Netherlands Railways.....	19,300	22,176	41,476	0	0	Italian State.....	167,788	410,150	577,938	0	0
Canadian National.....	89,200	26,989	116,189	0	0	German Federal.....	397,200	306,845	704,045	0	0
British Rail.....		353,760	353,760	0	0	French National.....	423,637	477,247	900,884	0	0
Japanese National.....		375,850	375,850	0	0	U.S. Class I Railroads.....	0	0	0	946,334	677,633

Note: These statistics, and others used throughout this article unless otherwise specified, are for calendar 1968, the most recent year for which comparable figures are available due to changed methods of reporting. While the actual figures have not changed, the relationships remain much the same. For example, while U.S. railways earned less and paid smaller taxes in 1971, the French Railways' total cost to taxpayers that year rose to \$1,200,000,000. And British Rail is still deep in the red, despite a 1969 Act of Parliament which wrote off much of BR's debt and provided grants

in advance rather than subsidies after the fact. Not included in the U.S. figures are comparatively smaller payments made by public authorities to railroads in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts to help offset rising commuter-service losses. Biggest such payment in 1968 was \$6,374,279 by New Jersey to 5 commuter roads.

Source: International Railway Statistics (Paris), as extracted by Union Pacific researchers; AAR.

COAST GUARD BUDGET AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, the Senate Commerce Committee is currently considering authorizations for the U.S. Coast Guard. The President's budget request for fiscal year 1973 includes funding for the construction of a Coast Guard air station in North Bend, Ore. The establishment of this air station would allow more effective enforcement of American laws. It would also help to protect Oregon's commercial fishing industry from those foreign fishermen who continue to ignore our territorial integrity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement which I made before the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine on April 18 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BOB PACKWOOD BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE, APRIL 18, 1972

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, I want to thank you for this opportunity to appear before you today, and for holding hearings on Coast Guard authorizations.

I am testifying today in behalf of the authorization of a Coast Guard air station in North Bend, Oregon. In addition to providing increased surveillance of the Oregon coast, this air station would supply the increased search and rescue operations desperately needed in this area.

Throughout the commercial fishing season, I regularly receive letters and telegrams from irate Oregon fishermen who complain

about the intolerable invasion of our fishing zone by foreign fishing fleets. The presence of foreign ships presents a tremendous threat to Oregon's commercial fishing industry. Oregonians are understandably bitter about lengthy Coast Guard delays in answering their complaints of Soviet, Korean, and Japanese violations of our 12-mile limit.

In response to this problem, I have attempted since joining the Senate to insure that the interests of our commercial fishing industry receive the high priority they deserve.

In 1970, for example, I cosponsored a bill, which eventually became law, to increase the maximum fine for illegal fishing from \$10,000 to \$50,000. That same year, I cosponsored an amendment to the military sales act which prohibited assistance to the Republic of Korea until the President of the United States determined that no citizens of the Republic of Korea were fishing for salmon east of the line 175 degrees west longitude. More recently, I have cosponsored legislation to require that all fish aboard any foreign vessel found fishing in American waters must be forfeited.

Mr. Chairman, each of these proposals represents a major step toward achieving a solution to our foreign fishing problem. We must realize, however, that strong laws are not worth the paper they're printed on unless they are strictly enforced. Unfortunately, strict enforcement has been the exception rather than the rule in protecting America's commercial fishing industry from foreign encroachments. Until we provide adequate manpower and equipment to catch the violators, and impose the fines we legislate, foreign fishermen will continue to ignore our territorial integrity. The construction of an air station at North Bend would allow more aggressive enforcement of existing law.

Oregon fishermen have assured me that their bitterness stems not so much from the action of foreign fleets as from the inaction

of Federal departments and agencies. In the past, the justified concerns of Oregon commercial fishermen have been met with mere expressions of sympathy or apology. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that Oregon fishermen deserve and expect better treatment. I am here today to insure that they receive it.

VIETNAM ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, first, what has been the price of the Nixon war policy?

When is the President prepared to fulfill his promise to the American people to end the war? On August 8, 1968 in accepting the Republican Party nomination, the President said:

I pledge to you tonight that the first priority foreign policy objective of our next Administration will be to bring an honorable end to the war in Vietnam. . . . My fellow Americans, the dark long night for America is about to end.

What honor is there for the President to be known as "the greatest bomber in history? Since President Nixon's inauguration, more than 6 million tons of bombs have been dropped in Vietnam—1 ton for every minute he has been in office—more than the combined total dropped during World War II and Korea. In a mere 3 years, Nixon has dropped more bombs than President Johnson did in 5 years.

There is a deepening despair increasing in this country as a result of President Nixon's resumption of the bombing attacks against major ports of North Vietnam.